



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/797,029	03/11/2004	Nandagopal Venugopal	RIC02009	4644
25537	7590	06/29/2010		
VERIZON PATENT MANAGEMENT GROUP 1320 North Court House Road 9th Floor ARLINGTON, VA 22201-2909			EXAMINER KANG, SUK JIN	
			ART UNIT 2477	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 06/29/2010	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patents@verizon.com

<p align="center">Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</p>	<p>Application No. 10/797,029</p>	<p>Applicant(s) VENUGOPAL ET AL.</p>	
	<p>Examiner SUK JIN KANG</p>	<p>Art Unit 2477</p>	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 04 June 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: _____.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information *Disclosure Statement*(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____.
13. ☐ Other: _____.

/S. K./
Examiner, Art Unit 2477
6/22/10

/Gregory B Sefcheck/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2477

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The prior art reads on the rejected claims and thus the rejection is maintained. Applicant argues that Grover does not disclose or suggest "selecting one of the plurality of ring cover candidates as a recommended ring cover candidate by selecting the one of the ring cover candidates having a highest number of loaded network spans".

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's argument because as recited in the above rejections, Gardner, as modified by Grover, does teach and suggest selecting one of the plurality of ring cover candidates as a recommended ring cover candidate by selecting the one of the ring cover candidates having a highest number of loaded network spans.

Gardner teaches and discloses techniques for finding ring covers in survivable networks. Gardner discloses generating a plurality of ring cover candidates based on received network configuration information and traffic demand information for a network (page 1, column 2, lines 5-6 and 19-24; page 2, column 1, lines 4-14, 24-27, and 35-38). Gardner further discloses and suggests choosing rings by determining and choosing the cover with the heaviest links, which suggests selecting the cover with the highest number of loaded spans (page 4, column 2, lines 24-31).

Grover also teaches and suggests determining the number of loaded spans covered by the ring candidate (abstract; column 3, lines 54-65; columns 4, lines 43-52 and 65-67). Grover goes on to further suggest that choosing a best candidate rings having the highest ratio of transport utility (U)/cost (C), wherein U is measured by the number of demands of the span (column 3, lines 66-67; column 4, lines 1-3; column 5, lines 51-56). Thus in determining the best ring candidate to select, Grover suggests the system should consider choosing the ring candidate with the highest number of demand routes. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate counting the loaded network spans and selecting the ring cover candidates based on the loaded spans as taught by Grover with the method as disclosed by Gardner for the purpose of effectively identifying and designing a more efficient ring cover candidate in order to restore a network.

Applicants are reminded that claims subject to examination will be given their broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification. In re Morris, 127 F.3d 1048, 1054-55 (Fed. Cir. 1997). As a matter of fact, the "examiner has the duty of police claim language by giving it the broadest reasonable interpretation." Springs Window Fashions LP v. Novo Industries, L.P., 65 USPQ2d 1862, 1830, (Fed. Cir. 2003). Applicants are also reminded that claimed subject matter not the specification, is the measure of the invention. Disclosure contained in the specification cannot be read into the claims for the purpose of avoiding the prior art. In re Sporck, 55 CCPA 743, 386 F.2d, 155 USPQ 687 (1986).

In response to applicant's arguments, it is noted that, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See In re Keller, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); In re Merck & Co., 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). It is also noted that the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See In re Keller, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981).